

REMARKS

The specification and drawings have been objected to. Claim 1 has been amended to conform with the current specification and drawings to point out that the seal cartridges are retained by the retaining ring. Claim 7 has been cancelled.

Claims stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schaefer..

Claims 1, 8, 10 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Commette et al. While the device of the Schaefer patent is well known to Applicants having a common assignee, the instant invention represents a substantial advance over such prior art. Contrary to the assertion in the office action, the side seal cartridges 44 and 45 of Schaefer are not held in by his air cap 30 by rather by the threads shown particularly in Figure 2. Commette does not these limitations either. While Commette may have side seal cartridges 9 and 11, such are held in place via threads (near numeral 15) and there is no retaining ring as claimed to work in conjunction with friction to hold the cartridges in place. Even if these two references were combined, the claimed limitations would not be present. It is respectfully submitted that such limitations are more than a simple matter of design choice.

The limitations of claims 8, 21 and 22 are also not present in the references of record. Sales of product incorporating the features of the instant invention have exceeded 10,000 units since introduction for a value exceeding \$17,000,000. Such commercial success in view of the many competitive products (of Assignee and others) that preceded the invention have been afforded by greatly increased life and ease of use. This evidence of commercial success was apparently

ignored in the Office Action responded to. Accordingly, it is submitted that the limitations in the claims are not obvious and more than a matter of design choice. These facts are further set forth in the declaration to be filed.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Commette and Keller. It is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is patentable both for the limitations contained therein as well as for the limitations of the parent claims.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Commette and Levy. It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is patentable both for the limitations contained therein as well as for the limitations of the parent claims.

Claims 13, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer in view of Commette and Ten Pas. While Ten Pas may indeed disclose a spray gun for fast setting materials, his purpose in doing so is very different from Applicants. Ten Pas discloses his fittings 44 for lubrication (col. 4, lines 30-46) and the passages 20 etc. mentioned do not connect to purge air of any other passages normally filled by mixed material as claimed. Applicants, on the other hand, connect the zerk fitting 25 to the purge air passage 8a. This allows the fluid passages in the mix chamber 19 and the front end of the gun to be filled with grease (which mixes with the purge air to prevent setup and crystallization. Such injection will allow the spray gun to be stored overnight with having to be completely cleaned. Such structure or use is nowhere contemplated or suggested in either Schaefer, Commette or Ten Pas.

Appl.No. 10/532,436
Amdt.dated December 7, 2009
Reply to Office action of July 6, 2009

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended patentably distinguish over the references of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/dbf/

Douglas B. Farrow
Registration No. 28582
Graco Inc.
PO Box 1441
Minneapolis, MN 55440
(612) 623-6769
dfarrow@graco.com